DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 444 940 SP 039 391

AUTHOR	Marchant, Catherine
TITLE	In the Middle: Negotiating Multiple Perspectives of School Reform.
PUB DATE	2000-04-25
NOTE	18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Change Strategies; Early Childhood Education; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Self Evaluation (Individuals); Teacher Improvement; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*Reform Efforts; Reform Strategies

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the perspective of professional developers as change agents of reform, presenting a self-study of one professional developer/change agent's experiences in an urban school system during the initial year of reform. It highlights obstacles and supports she encountered while working at two early education schools during the project's first 2 years and examines her need for the same kind of deep-seated, reflective, and transformative professional development required of teachers with whom she worked. Ethnographic methods were used to describe her experiences, including field notes of activities and feelings about both sites, monthly invoices, periodic progress reports, minutes from project meetings, documents and artifacts about reform, and notes from a support group meeting for professional developers. The paper concludes with lessons learned that were different from those already reported in other projects. For example, her role as middleman (linking the reformers sponsoring the change to the school teachers and principals) was difficult and complicated her role as coach. Implications for reform include: change is complex, and attention to its process is important; sensitivity to change processes means interrogating one's own and others' assumptions about how learning happens; and professional developers need professional development. (Contains 36 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Marchant
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

In the middle: Negotiating multiple perspectives of school reform

Catherine Marchant
Wheelock College
AERA Symposium
April 25, 2000

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 444 940

Introduction

Much attention has been paid to the importance of teachers' professional development in school reform (Hamilton & Richardson, 1995; Little, 1993; Sykes & Darling-Hammond, 1999). The literature continually points to the need for deep transformation of classroom practices by teachers, if school reform is to become more than an elusive goal (Little, 1999; McLaughlin, 1999). Additionally, much has been written about the need for new forms of professional development for teachers so they will be able to achieve deep transformations of their teaching (Lieberman, 1995; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Sparks & Hirsh, 1997). Such professional development is characterized as problem-based (Zetlin, MacLeod, & Michener, 1998); job-embedded (Sparks & Hirsh, 1997); and critically reflective (Stein, Smith & Silver, 1999).

Less focus has been placed on the professional developers who work with teachers on changing practices (Freidus, 1996; Rust, 1989; Wilson & Ball, 1996), even though they are key change agents in reform (Freidus, Grose, McNamara, 1997; McLaughlin, 1998). Missing from the discussion too is the professional developers' need for their own professional development (Freidus & Grose, 1998; Rust, 1998; Stein, Smith, & Silver, 1999). There is much more to be learned about the new and varied role of professional developer/change agent and the ways in which it is played out in schools. Some professional developers are outside "experts"— teacher educators or skilled specialists from universities or external agencies; others are in-house "experts"—teacher leaders or peer coaches from within the school system. Some professional developers work for external agencies funding or sponsoring reform; others work for school systems, either at the district or site level. They are referred to as coaches, staff developers, tutors, critical friends, or facilitators, each term suggesting variations on the role, its demands and expectations. Whatever they are dubbed, reform-era professional developers are school-based change agents who help shape and are shaped by the reform process (Ullman, 1999). They are players in reform whose unique perspective is informed both by the intentions of the reformers and the realities of the teachers and principals trying to make it happen.

As participants in the middle of the reform effort, professional developers have a unique perspective on the reform process itself as well as the role they play in it. While some attention has been paid to the multiple functions they perform, such as troubleshooting, motivating, supporting change (Guskey, 1995), less has been devoted to the skills and knowledge required for them to be successful change agents (Freidus, McNamara, & Grose, 1997) or to their own understanding of their experiences. Analyzing reform from the change agents' perspective may lead to a deeper understanding of the difficulties and an identification of the supports needed by schools striving toward improvement. Just as teachers have practical, experiential knowledge about teaching that needs to be included in the dialogue on teaching (Clandinin & Connolly, 1986; Lieberman & Miller, 1991), professional developers have practical, experiential knowledge to contribute to the dialogue on reform.

This paper is one of several in an AERA symposium focused on the perspective of professional developers as change agents of reform. It results from a self-study of my experiences as a professional developer/change agent in an urban school system during the initial

SP039391

years of reform. It aims first, to make explicit the obstacles and supports I encountered as I worked at two early education schools during the first two years of the project; and second, to examine my need for the same kind of deep-seated, reflective and transformative professional development opportunities required of the teachers with whom I worked. It tells the story of change from my perspective because as Lampert (2000) suggests, as teacher/researcher I have both a better sense of the whole experience and the capacity to uncover invisible, relational aspects of the work that may be unrecognizable to outsiders. Whether a self study is research or thoughtful practice (Zechner as cited in Lampert, 2000), the paper is meant to add meaning to the struggles associated with school reform by offering a viewpoint thusfar missing in the literature.

Methodology

Ethnographic methods were used to describe and interpret my experiences. To generate layers of data that captured the complexity (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) of being a professional developer in a reform effort, I drew on the field notes I kept of my activities at and feelings about both sites; the monthly invoices and periodic progress reports I had to write; and the minutes of project meetings as well as documents and artifacts about reform I collected. Additionally, I used notes from my participation in a small support group I attended with other professional developers in the same system and I talked through my experiences with another teacher educator who had been involved in a similar reform effort in another school system.

Data analysis has been guided by conceptual assistance from the literature and discussion with two colleagues on this symposium. Initially, I coded important chunks of data from my field notes and generated themes related to my work with the reform agency and the schools. Then, I compared my findings with those of other professional development projects (Freidus & Grose, 1998; Rust, et.al., 1998; Stein, Smith, & Silver, 1999; Zetlin, MacLeod & Michener, 1998). By studying my experiences in this way, I have come to see the complications brought on by being in the middle of reform, and how discrepancies between personal, professional and contextual perspectives further confound the process of change. Though the project under study is a four year endeavor, this paper is based on the first two not only because of the nature of the initial years of a reform effort but also due to the occurrence of major organizational changes at the end of the second year.

The Case of Two ECSs

It started with a phone call from the principal of one of the city's early childhood schools (ECS-I), asking if I would consider becoming the "coach" for a reform project into which she and the teachers had been accepted. At the time, there was nothing particularly unusual about her call. It appeared similar to other requests for consultation I had received over time as a teacher educator/professional developer. While I did not need anymore projects for the semester, my interest was peeked by previously stimulating and rewarding experiences at the school. Previously, I had supervised student teachers assigned to one of her classrooms from the local graduate school where I teach early childhood development and education courses. Furthermore, one year I had been the school's consultant on inclusion, a position that afforded me some intermittent classroom observations and training activities with all the teachers. As supervisor and consultant, I had always found the school to be an exciting and productive early childhood setting and the teachers to be hardworking and knowledgeable practitioners.

However, what intrigued me most about the principal's request was her use of the term, "coach". As she explained her understanding of the coach's role and the difficulties she had experienced finding the right person for the role, I envisioned it to be similar to the new kind of professional developer I had read about in the literature (Lieberman, 1995; Little, 1993). That is, someone who could work with teachers in the classroom and at meetings pushing their thinking

about practice further as well as facilitating school-wide discussions related to improving teaching and learning for all children. Being a coach at ECS-I seemed to convey the very type of insider/outsider relationship I enjoyed having with a group of teachers. I thought it would be one that would afford me the time and involvement to understand the school from within, while bringing in the perspective of the wider early childhood community.

The only hitch to coaching at ECS-I was the commitment to coach at ECS-II at the same time. ECS-II was new to me, although one of the teachers there had been a student of mine when she was an undergraduate. While hesitant about taking on a new school, I saw work in these two schools as an opportunity for constant comparison of the same project in two different settings and thus a broader understanding of the contexts of reform and coaching as it pertains to early childhood. As it turned out, coaching in one setting did help me to understand what was happening in the other and led to personal convictions about the way in which the climate and environment of the school help to shape reform.

Not long after that initial phone call and interviews with both principals and representatives from the sponsoring agency, I was hired to coach at the two ECSs as part of the New Schools Project. Like any new position, I started out with preconceived notions about what the role would entail based upon the information provided me by the schools and the agency plus my own similar experiences as a teacher, teacher educator and consultant. In a presentation to my graduate students, I explained the role of coach this way.

> The city's external, privately supported public education fund (PEF) decided last year to change the way in which it supports individual schools by selecting a number of them through a competitive process for the specific purpose of implementing standards-based reform. Standards are part of a national and state reform effort to improve student learning in all public schools. The first group of city schools to engage in this type of reform is now part of the PEF funded New Schools Project. Those schools received not only a grant to support their efforts but also the assistance of a coach who is charged with guiding them through the change process. That coach averages about one day per week at the school, working with the principal and teams of teachers on activities related to reform. I am the coach for two of the city's early childhood schools which offer full day programs (7:30am-6pm) to children from three to six years old (preschool to first grade). (HDF 524 Class notes, 2/97)

Over the course of the first year, my perspective on coaching changed considerably as I spent more time in the ECSs and at biweekly coaches meetings. As a coach, it turned out that I engaged in many more activities in the schools and at the agency than my initial overview suggested. I observed in classrooms; talked individually with teachers about children and early childhood practices; facilitated some school based meetings and participated in others; met individually with principals on a regular basis and at principals' meetings periodically; organized or led professional development sessions; attended coaches meetings and conferred with other coaches about their schools; and spent time in the library or my home office looking for resources to share with teachers. The role seemed to grow with each visit I made to the school or meeting I attended at the agency. By the end of the first year, I no longer saw coaching as that ideal, cutting edge form of professional development to which I was so attracted. Instead, I defined it as a complex array of roles that challenged my skills as a teacher educator. In fact, I described it to a prospective coach who called me during the summer between my first and second year like this:

> It is the hardest work I have ever done. It's part expert, part cheerleader, part resource person, part teacher educator, part colleague, part friend.... And that only pertains to the role in the schools! There's also a lot you have to do with the PEF. Trying to represent the school, negotiating and liaisoning....It's the kind of position that forces you to use all the skills and knowledge you have

> as an early childhood teacher educator—it's a real test of your ability to put what you preach at the college into practice in the real world of a school. (Personal communication with J., 6/97)

What happened to bring about these changes in my thinking about coaching is the story of my first year at the ECSs, a year devoted to building a positive working relationship with each school. As noted by others (Joyce & Showers, 1995; Darling-Hammond, 1998), introducing new visions of teaching into teachers' current practices is complex and potentially uncomfortable. I think it is particularly complex and uncomfortable for professional developers/change agents like myself who spend more time in college classrooms than schools or work more with prospective rather than practicing teachers. While I did not approach coaching teachers at the ECSs naively, I experienced the realities of helping teachers change their practices more directly and intensely than I had in any of my earlier roles. The New Schools Project challenged me to utilize the best of what I knew worked with teachers and yet showed how much more I needed to learn about facilitating teacher development. It was a struggle that I did not fully understand until much later.

First Year Relationships with the Schools: Getting Started

Conscious of the importance of my entry into the ECSs as a new person or a familiar person in a new role, I spent much of the first year getting to know the teachers and the school, figuring out who they were and the culture of their settings. At the same time, I searched for something that would unite the teachers as a group--a project, an issue, a need they could collaborate on. Mindful of the importance of getting to action quickly in order to capture the confidence of the teachers (Sebring & Bryk, 2000), I brought in relevant resources such as articles and units of curriculum in which they had expressed interest. I kept them informed of pertinent events in the area and provided information on other districts' reform plans. My initial goal was to make my presence in the school felt in visible, concrete and helpful ways.

At ECS-I, teachers were eager to spend their time on the areas of the program they had previously targeted for improvement, namely assessment and its relationship to children's progress. They wasted no time in soliciting my input and organized meetings to discuss it. However, the more we discussed the topic, the more obvious it became that teachers had different expectations for children and used different outcomes to measure learning. These differences in teachers' beliefs were clearly interfering with their ability to figure out a school wide approach to assessment. This realization led to a collective interest in developing a document that would outline what teachers expected children to know and be able to do by the time they graduated from ECS, and further what opportunities could be provided children to ensure that these expectations were met. Even though the task proved to be time-consuming, periodically frustrating and intellectually challenging, it turned out to be what they were most invested in by the end of the year. It became the common goal that bound us together.

At ECS-II, for a variety of reasons, the teachers and principal were not as prepared for a quick start. They did not have the same organizational structures (e.g, extended blocks of time for meetings, previous collaborative work) in place nor as much mutual understanding of learning and teaching at the early childhood level. Nevertheless, they shared a strong interest in documenting what they already did well. To help that process get started and with their encouragement, I completed an informal review of the program based on a New Schools Project document of essentials for effective schools and made specific recommendations for next steps. That activity on my part was a turning point for our work together. As I learned later, this was a school with a history of talking about best practices but little concerted effort to come to agreement about implementing them. My assessment of the state of their school sparked strong interest and investment in their own self-assessment and plans for change.

It was no surprise to me that each ECS experienced a different pathway to reform during that first year, but refreshing to note that they both got to the same point by year's end. In fact, I noted it in my final monthly report for the year,

> What has struck me most about [the end results for both ECSs] is that although they each approached the task of looking at their programs very differently (with ECS-I's major work on the outline of learning expectations and opportunities for children coming from teacher interests and ECS-II's program review growing out of a memo I initiated), their work in now closly aligned as they each focus on what should 3-6 year olds learn and how should they be taught. (Monthly report, 5/97)

I believe it was the freedom to follow their own pathways that enabled the ECSs to reach similar goals. At ECS-I, I followed the teachers' lead in determining a focus for collective work and helped them to discover their need to resolve philosophical differences about teaching and learning in early childhood. Whereas at ECS-II, I seized upon--but did not orchestrate--an opportunity to jump-start the thinking of the group. Neither could I have predicted the pathway of each school nor could I have planned it any better. Like the learning of children, the learning of teachers takes on different forms and trajectories. What I did was trust that learning would happen and I did so by relying on past knowledge of teacher development and previous experience as a teacher educator.

In both schools, I began coaching from where the teachers were in their thinking about their school and their teaching. Our work together grew out of their initial goals, even though the goals may have seemed far afield of the goals of the reform project. I started where teachers were in their thinking about their own teaching as a way of getting at their thinking about reform. In their latest work on teachers, Lieberman and Miller (1999) remind us once again that

> The literature on adult and teacher career development and the processes of teacher change supports the need to adapt professional development to the specific teachers for whom the development is intended. Every staff is a collection of individuals, with his or her own personal and career history. One size does not fit all; this is as true for teachers as it is for the students they teach. (p. 68)

My willingness to be responsive to their thinking and to act on their concerns made it worthwhile for them to discuss teaching and learning in their school. I was not like those other outsiders who pursued their "own agenda irregardless of ours". In short, the teachers saw me as an outsider they "could trust", a consultant who "understood our perspective" and a colleague interested in figuring out a reform agenda "tailored to our school". Their trust in my openness to their perspective became the foundation for our joint work and made it possible for them to eventually entertain notions of change. Starting where teachers are and integrating their perspective into the agenda has remained a guiding premise of mine over the course of my time with the New Schools Project. As I stated toward the end of the first year,

> Just as teachers need to take risks, trust their students' abilities and guide rather than force learning, so too coaches must take risks, trust their teachers and guide them through the change process in a way that works for them. (Monthly report, 5/97)

However, that premise presented me with other problems, especially when it came to my relationship with the agency sponsoring reform.

First year relationship with the reform agency: In the middle

From the beginning of my involvement with the New Schools Project, I anticipated playing the role of middleman, that is, being responsible both to the ECSs and to the project. I sensed I would be a major source of communication between the schools and the agency. I recognized that much of the burden for implementing the project rested with me and my ability to function as a go-between. I even expected some tensions to result from my interfacing with both parties and my need to help them reconcile any differences in their perspectives. However, I was not prepared for the extent of tension that grew between me (as well as other coaches) and the agency during the first year. Nor was I able to understand the source of such tension while I was steeped in it.

Because the New Schools Project was innovative and unique to the city school system, there were minimal guidelines for coaching, no clear expectations for change and only generic literature outlining best practices in reform. As participants in cutting edge work, all of us—coaches, reform agency staff, teachers in schools—were simultaneously doing reform while trying to figure out how to reform. Such experiences can be intellectually challenging and stimulating. Unfortunately, at the same time they may also prove to be fraught with frustration, anxiety and miscommunication, especially when confronted with the realities of life in schools. I did not worry about these possibilities when I became a coach because I thought the reform agency and I shared a strong commitment to and similar beliefs about school reform. From my early discussions with agency staff and my reading of their written materials, I thought we had agreed about the need for reform to take place school by school and teacher by teacher, and that change in schools takes both time and effort. Yet the more we interfaced, the less obvious our agreement.

During the first year, most of my interactions with members of the reform agency occurred at meetings and through memos. The focus of discussions and information centered on the steps that the project felt schools had to follow in order to implement change. These steps were dubbed as essentials and addressed the components of school improvement noted in the literature. Coaches attended bi-monthly meetings where we were updated on project thinking about the essentials and trained in a variety of strategies for helping schools meet the essentials. For example, coaches participated in training sessions on a protocol for collaborative assessment, a manual for completing a school resource audit, and the development of comprehensive school plans that expedite reform. The end result of these early interactions was valuable information about what needed to happen in schools, but little help in the ultimate struggle of coaching, that is, how to make it happen. After one of the meetings, I wrote in my field notes,

> Why are all my notes from meetings in the form of directives? "Use protocol to." "Prioritize scheduling as." "Use T2 $$ for." It seems that every meeting I attend leads to more that I have to do. Somehow I thought it would be more about what's really happening in schools and how can we support the schools' efforts....I know time is of the essence but I don't think just pushing the changes will make them happen. Or do I just not know how to do it? (Field notes, 3/97)

Because there was little time at meetings for coaches to network with each other, it was only later that I learned of the similarity of my struggles to those of my colleagues.

Typically, meetings were both polite and argumentative. Project staff would explain a new idea or mandate a new activity for schools, coaches would listen at first and then question the idea or raise concerns about its implementation, whereupon project staff would counter these points and disagreement would follow. The discussion would continue in this fashion until it inevitably ended with the original directive repeated for coaches to implement in their schools. I

found these meetings counterproductive and anxiety-producing. In the margins of my notes at one meeting, I asked, "Why are we spending so much time debating this? Is our purpose in the schools to implement or to guide the implementation [of reform]?" (Field notes, 4/97)

My way of dealing with my concerns was to use monthly reports as a venue for presenting my personal views of reform. Rather than being confrontational, I tried to explain my thinking about the issues and the project's plans as they pertained specifically to the ECSs. In this way, I hoped to convey what it was like to be caught in the middle of two potentially valid points of view. I saw the monthly reports as an opportunity to present the insider perspective on change in hope that it would open up the possibility for negotiation between the schools and the agency. As the following examples suggest, these reports were full of comments about time constraints, the process of change, and the culture of the school—the very factors that made it difficult to make change happen.

> Systemic reform does not happen in 180 seven-hour days. (Monthly report, 5/97)
> Much of what we are asking teachers to do takes up a great deal of time, discussion and [causes] immense frustration. (Field notes, 4/97)
> Factors operating with the culture of the school...are impeding progress . They will unfold over time and then can be addressed. (Monthly report, 3/97)

Unfortunately, there was no explicit feedback mechanism to coaches from the agency regarding these reports. I assumed my points were being made but the communication loop was never completed formally, though occasionally in conversation I learned my points at least had been received. The lack of open and ongoing communication became a major obstacle during the first year. Without some form of dialogue, my relationship with the agency did little to illuminate what was working in my schools, what was not and why. Any insights I gained about my work were derived from conversations I had with other coaches and my reading of the literature on the importance of context in teacher change (Richardson, 1990; Loucks-Horsley & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Showers, Joyce & Bennett, 1987).

Another layer of frustration, having to do with coaches' professional growth, was operating between coaches and reformers. Like other coaches, I joined the New Schools Project in part to seize the opportunity to be part of the design and development of a school reform effort. I had envisioned participation in an innovative project where roles and responsibilities had not yet been outlined and the process of change had not yet been delineated. It was to have been an ideal way of growing professionally, reminiscent of the kinds of inquiry based professional development advocated for teachers by many researchers (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Cochran-Smith & Lytle; 1993; Lieberman, 1995; Little, 1993). When that opportunity did not come to fruition, frustration set in.

While coaches may have seen the New Schools Project as an ideal forum for inquiry on reform, the project staff was reluctant to make changes based on our input and remained controlling of our work in the schools. By the end of the first year, coach and agency differences seemed irreconcilable. It took a study of the coaches' role by outside evaluators to make clear how far apart our perspectives had grown and how strained our relationship had become.

> Still, there was considerable tension between the coaches and the [reform agency] staff about how to implement the [New Schools Project] so that schools would make changes that improved student learning. The conflicts did not arise, fundamentally, out of the design of the [New Schools Project]. Rather, they were related to a) differences of opinion between coaches and the [reform agency] leadership about how to best implement reform at the schools, b) the [reform agency]'s

> strategy for training, supervising, and learning from coaches, and c) problems of communication about these issues. (Neufeld and Woodworth, 1997)

Coaches wanted to be involved in shaping the project not only because we felt our perspectives from within schools offered a significant contribution, but also because we needed that kind of collaborative learning and problem solving for own professional development. The very conditions coaches wanted to put in place for teachers were the very conditions we intuitively knew we needed themselves. When these differences were identified and acknowledged prior to the beginning of the second year of the project, tensions subsided.

Second year relationships with the schools: Refining the role of coach

A major difference between the first and second year of coaching in the New Schools Project resulted from the addition of a second set of coaches to work directly with schools. Recognizing the importance of content knowledge in improving teacher practices, the reform staff decided to hire content coaches to work with teachers in their classrooms. Rather than finding another consultant to spend another half day each week in their schools, the ECS principals requested that I function as their content coach and increase my time on-site. The additional time was a considerable help to implementing plans formulated during the first year. While time remained a central issue, my presence in the ECSs one full day and one additional meeting time each week allowed us to establish and maintain a momentum of change. In addition, it modeled the kind of integrated teaching and learning the teachers tried to emulate with children.

> Particularly at the early childhood level, I think this integrated coaching model is not only more realistic but also better aligned with the kind of holistic teaching/learning/schooling that should occur for young children....As [one principal] suggested content does not separate from process at this level as easily as it might at another. (Field notes, August 1997)

My second year of coaching brought teachers and their instructional practices into focus. While we continued with school-wide, grade level and other group meetings, there was equal amount of time available for me to work directly with teachers. Whether it was co-teaching during literacy block, demonstrating new instructional techniques, or thinking together about children, this classroom-centered time was reserved for teaching and learning. At ECS-I, our goal for Year II was to translate the expectations and opportunities that we had spent so much time articulating into daily classroom practices. I supported the school again in a spontaneous and flexible way by working with teachers on topics of their choice and in ways they chose. Thus, I spent several weeks working with one teacher to develop a video on her version of the early childhood literacy block. I worked with another on her use of literature as the center of her weekly curriculum plans intermittently over a semester. My work with each teacher was different, but all of it was based on a mutual understanding of teacher's self knowledge and interests as the deciding factor in the focus of coaching.

At ECS-II, coaching was more intentional and regularly scheduled. Because all the teachers at ECS-II wanted to spend Year II assessing their own practices by comparing them to those described in the literature and those in schools where literacy programs were already well established, I scheduled time in each classroom on a rotating basis. The aim was for every teacher to develop not only a similar sense of best practices in early literacy, but also a unique sense of how her classroom compared with exemplars. It was my responsibility to assist each teacher in that personal assessment/development process. That meant I co-taught at times, demonstrated new instructional techniques at other times or discussed children as needed. In each case, the teachers were ultimately in charge of the content of my coaching. Had there not

been additional demands from the district or the reformers, Year II could have been a more productive and less stressful year than Year I.

In the second year of reform, the school district became increasingly involved in the ECSs because of its own reform plans. As a result, there were multiple competing demands – requests from the agency and mandates from the district – often with conflicting messages. One particular case involved the way in which coaches and teachers reviewed student work. New Schools coaches had developed a protocol for collaborative assessment and begun using it with their schools when the district developed another protocol and required its use as well. Not only did teachers at the ECSs feel they were being asked to do two versions of the same thing but also they became confused by implicit messages inherent in very different approaches to the same task. It took a great deal of time to explain and sort out the messages with the teachers and then renegotiate requirements with the system—a great deal of time distracted from the agenda the teachers had set out for themselves.

Nor can the emotional toll these distractions took on teachers be underestimated. Several teachers became frustrated with the lack of alignment between the reform plans; others were deeply disappointed that the project they hoped would lead to improving their schools might turn out to be no better than others before. The lack of coordination between the district and the reform agency tested teachers' patience and interfered with the internal progress they had been making within their schools. Even though the external influences were never intended to distract us from our internal work, they did keep us from getting to the heart of transforming classroom practices. It was in too many ways proof of the potential "fragmentation, overload, and incoherence that can result from the uncritical acceptance of too many different innovations" (Fullan, 1991, p. 197).

Navigating second year experiences once again tested my ability to function equally well in the world of the schools and that of the reformers. As the person in the middle of the reform agenda and the teachers' agenda, I saw how the ECSs were improving as a result of both agendas. I had first hand knowledge of how the requests of the reformers were enacted and how well they served (or did not) to get teachers to work collaboratively for school-wide purposes. When progress was slow, I tried to convince the agency that teachers were not trying to thwart change, rather they were trying to make sense of change in the context of their working environment. I prefaced many comments about the schools with "This is a group of teachers who until recently...." or "If you remember where the group started, you can understand...." In turn, as the representative of the reformers on site, I often explained the rationale for a request and always tried to help teachers understand the intent of reform and the complexities of the change process. Many of these explanations at meetings were prefaced by

> It's not that someone at [the reform agency] or [the school system] is trying to make your life as a teacher more difficult. They're really trying to help in the long term. Their requests stem from what we know now, what studies have shown about effective schools and how they got to be that way. (Field notes, 2/98)

The role of person in the middle took on more importance during Year II when we encountered more distractions from our school-based agenda. Toward the end of the second year, I began to redefine coaching in light of its broader context. In my second year self evaluation, I wrote

> I really see the role of coach as similar to that of a consultant, but a consultant who is part "higher ed" partner, part ethnographer, and part liaison. By this I mean that as coach for the ECSs, I help

> keep teachers informed about current research and practices (the higher ed piece), investigate and try to understand how the schools function as educational organizations (the ethnography piece) and help each to mediate its own reform interests and those of [the agency] and [the school district] (the liaison piece). I think this approach to coaching has worked for PEF as well because school reform involves updating schools (the higher ed piece), understanding schools from an insider's perspective (the ethnography piece) and negotiating individualized pathways to change for each school (the liaison piece). (Report dated 4/98).

While an exciting position to be in, it was also a frustrating one, one which could potentially strain my relationship with either or both parties. It was during periods of high frustration that I again turned to the reform agency for support and had it not been available my work probably would have been compromised.

Second year relationship with the agency: Needing professional development for myself

The report of the outside evaluators led to a full day meeting of the New School project staff and coaches early in the second year to discuss differences, consider potential solutions and plan for the upcoming year. Hearing from other coaches who shared many of the same concerns, experienced similar difficulties in their schools, and were looking for support to help them figure out next steps helped me recognize that professional developers also need professional development. Until that time, I was worried that I was the only coach who was feeling inadequate, and worse yet that I did not know as much about facilitating teacher development and early childhood program improvement as I thought.

> The funny thing is that we all thought the quotes in [the evaluator's] report were our own when in reality it's just that we were all saying the same thing! Even more important, we're all crying out for additional training, support, learning about coaching—not just me. The folks from [another project] and [university] know we don't have the answers yet and we need help in discovering them. (Field notes, 9/97)

Additionally, the project hired a support person who had considerable experience working with other coaches on a variety of projects and readily understood the issues underlying tensions between coaches and reformers. Her presence led to structural changes in the way the project was organized, opportunities for coaches to voice their perspectives on how well reform was proceeding and more time for collaborative work. Under her leadership, coach workgroups were organized, small study groups formed, and meetings planned with input from coaches. These new structures provided a forum for coaches to reflect on and gain insight into coaching. They made it possible for me to better define some of the problems I was encountering at the ECSs. For example, the workgroup of which I was part became a place for wrestling with issues related to aligning the agency's and the district's reform plans. Even though the specific charge of the workgroup was not alignment, alignment was central to what we were working on and thus served as a resource for ideas on that problem. From such meetings, I returned to the ECSs with new insights about reform and what might be contributing to our struggles on site.

Furthermore, the changes in the way the reform agency treated coaches made a difference in how supported I felt. My participation in a workgroup that articulated and renegotiated one component of the reform effort was confirmation that I could contribute not only to the implementation of the project but also to its development. Discussion with a small group of coaches who shared my concerns about our roles legitimized my need to continuously reflect on my coaching experiences. And attendance at meetings that were planned from a coach's perspective were further proof that coaches could accomplish more as a team than individuals.

The reform agency's effort to improve its relationship with coaches was especially welcomed by those of us who believe that relationships are the foundation for improving any kind of human organization, including schools. Roland Barth's (1990) points about the crucial nature of adult relationships within schools are equally applicable to the adults involved in reform.

> ...insufficient attention has been given to the important relationships among the adults within the school and to a consideration of how the abundant untapped energy, inventiveness, and idealism within the schoolhouse might be encouraged. (p.xiv)

Unfortunately, the new structures for doing coach business were insufficient for the number of complications that arose during the year. Had the reform plan remained the same in the second year, the new structures probably would have sustained coaches in our work on-site. However, there was incredible pressure on the reform agency to accelerate the progress of change in the schools, competing demands on the schools from the district, and little feedback to schools from either the agency or the district regarding how well things were going. In many ways, the push for more progress actually detracted us from the progress we were beginning to make in classrooms and reinstated my feelings of frustration and inadequacy. The more pressure to show outcomes of our work, the more alienated from the project I became because I perceived the push for change as indication that the agency was returning to its old way of ignoring the voices of the very individuals most steeped in the reform effort. In one of my final reports that year, I noted

> [The reform agency] once again leaves me with only my own perspective on my work...I would like to see [our self assessment process, our meetings, our work] become a learning experience for everyone. Based on our collective [experiences] and knowledge, how can we improve on the role of the coach? How do we contribute to reform? This would be a great opportunity to rethink everyone's roles and working conditions—maybe even write an article on what effective coaches do [for reform]. (Monthly report, 5/98)

In another report based on the visits of two nationally known early childhood consultants to the ECSs, I returned to the importance of professional development for coaches

> [Mr. B.] reminded me that the essential details of effective interactions between young children and teachers are not in place in all classrooms and [Ms.W.] saw inconsistencies across the program that I have missed somehow. SO THE LESSON HERE IS THAT OUTSIDE RESOURCES ARE IMPORTANT TO A COACH'S WORK TOO. (Monthly report, 6/98)

Two years of coaching had changed my thinking about coaching, the nature of its complexity and the need it creates for the professional development of those engaged in it.

<u>Lessons learned from the self study: Similarities & differences to reports in the literature</u>

This self-study confirmed some of the findings already noted in the literature about the importance of professional developers in reform and their need for professional development. First, in my role as coach, I came to realize that I was not only a change agent but also a recipient of change (Freidus & Grose, 1997; Rust et al., 1998). Second, significant changes in my coaching resulted from the interplay of personal and professional understandings of teacher learning and reform (Cohen & Ball, 1990; Clandinin & Connelly, 1986; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1991; Loucks-Horsley & Stiegelbauer, 1991). Third, as my work with teachers became more complex, I recognized my own need for professional development which in turn instigated a rethinking of my views of professional development (Stein, Smith & Silver, 1999).

In my role as coach, I was a change agent who also experienced change in my own thinking and the way in which I worked with teachers. From the beginning I had intended to pay

careful attention to the teacher's perspective and allow it to shape my work with them. In the first year, I focused more on learning about the ECSs from the inside, and offered guidance from outside knowledge only at opportune moments. I resisted the efforts of reformers and school district personnel to accelerate the process of reform, instead sharing with them my belief in the ability of the ECSs to achieve the outcomes of reform via their own pathways. At the same time, however, I was influenced by the reform plan, the training I received as a coach and the pressure to show change in the schools. I did introduce new concepts to the teachers based on research as well as follow directives from the reform agency. I expanded my repertoire as a professional development provider by experimenting with new forms of professional development, such as study groups and looking at student work sessions. After two years, I was not the same coach I started out to be, but neither was a completely different one.

The way in which I changed as a coach resulted from the interplay of my current thinking about teacher learning and the professional development practices I used to support that learning with new ideas on teacher development in an era of reform and new strategies for transforming classroom practices I learned as a reform coach. Like teachers, I filtered new ideas through my personal knowledge base (Clandinin & Connelly, 1986; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1991); I interpreted the new through my existing lens (Cohen & Ball, 1990). Thus, I incorporated new ideas and strategies I learned at coaches trainings into my work with teachers at the ECSs when I assessed them to be useful and meaningful. The very process that I understood to happen to teachers—a slow integration of new concepts into current ways of thinking and doing--also happened to me. In much the same way the teachers with whom I was working were slowly changing by wrestling with new ideas in light of old ones and adopting aspects of the new that made sense in relation to the old, I was also changing by rethinking my approach to them within the context of reform. At the time, I was not as fully aware of the parallel between what was happening to the teachers and what was happening to me.

What I did know was that I needed more support and technical assistance as I continued coaching. As my work with teachers became more complex, I became increasingly cognizant of my own struggles as a professional developer. In similar fashion to the Southtown First Steps tutors investigated by Freidus, Grose & McNamara (1997; 1998), I had underestimated the complexity of initiating and implementing change from outside the school. Although I possessed both content knowledge of early childhood education and skills as a teacher educator, the change process I was charged to facilitate was more intense and required different skills than those in which I had become proficient. My experiences with student teachers, beginning teachers and teachers who saw themselves as learners just did not transfer so easily to all the teachers in this project. I often felt overwhelmed by extenuating circumstances, multiple levels of interpretation, and an inability to meet expectations I and others had set for my role. The context of reform made it difficult for me to apply old skills to new situations, challenged my understanding of professional development and made me realize that I, too, needed further professional development. My second year as a coach was less stressful primarily because of the professional development experiences organized for coaches and led by a coach's coach. Not only did they help me acquire or improve on skills, but also they served well in pushing my thinking about professional development. Until then, I ignored my own professional development almost as if I was in a position not to need it.

Like reports of change in other faculty members involved in the professional development of teachers (Stein, Smith & Silver, 1999; Zetlin, MacLeod & Michner, 1998), my view of the role of professional developer underwent changes. Although I have always taken the stance as collaborator rather than expert in my work in schools, that orientation took on new meaning as I worked as a coach. Because I had not been in similar situations before, I had no

personal guidelines to use. Because there is little research about coaching in reform, I had no professional guidelines to which to turn. Problem setting and solving at the ECSs took the best of my thinking in conjunction with the best of the teachers' thinking. It was our collective thinking and learning that led to change. The more I got to know the real problems faced by the teachers and principals in my schools from their perspectives, the more able I was to work collaboratively with them to craft solutions and the better able I was to contribute ideas toward those solutions. My coaching in turn has enhanced my own teaching at the college level as I strive more than ever to integrate theory and practice on campus so that prospective teachers are better prepared to do the same in the schools.

Different lessons from those already reported

While much of what I learned about coaching is similar to the lessons of other projects, some of my learnings have been different. Unlike other professional development experiences described and analyzed in the literature, my case was framed by my role as a middleman, the person who links the reformers sponsoring change and the teachers and principals in schools undergoing change. Being positioned in the middle allowed me a unique perspective on the reform process, one I welcomed initially. Nonetheless it became an increasingly difficult position to navigate, especially in terms of my relationship with the reform agency. The obstacles I faced here were only partially mitigated by the supports I found in other coaches, the teachers and principals in the ECSs, and the professional development I received during the second year. Preparing this self study, especially in light of the literature on a learning perspective toward change, helped to elucidate the assumptions operating on my part as well as those of the reformers and the subsequent ways in which we often operated at cross purposes.

At this point, approaches to school reform and related professional development for teachers fall into seemingly dichotomous categories: procedural or principled (Lieberman & Miller, 1999); technical or transformative (Hoffman & Pearson, 2000); learning or implementation oriented (Little, 1999). While not mutually exclusive, one or the other category usually dominates the thinking of the individuals involved and drives the decisions that are made. The current literature is full of arguments in favor of one or other approach. Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) argue for reform agenda professional development for teachers that supports a learner-centered view of teaching and a career-long conception of teacher learning. In the same vein, Little (1999) warns against an implementation perspective, suggesting that an implementation perspective with its focus on structural change distracts teachers from the business of teaching and learning, while a learning perspective with its emphasis on ongoing professional dialogue centers teachers on the classroom and instruction. Some researchers point to the need for both approaches. Lieberman & Miller (1999) argue that it takes both procedural and principled approaches to create and sustain fundamental shifts in teaching, learning and schooling. Hoffman & Pearson (2000) support "a nesting of training within a broader construct of teaching." (p.40) These frameworks for thinking about a reform project were useful to my investigation of my coaching experiences.

The issue of a learning oriented or implementation oriented approach to reform became central to my thinking about my struggles as a change agent/middleman and helped me sort out what had really happened. To begin with, I believe in the need for a learning perspective toward change. It takes into account that change is really a learning process and that adults and children learn in much the same way, through active involvement and thinking about and articulating what they know. Because of this belief, I framed my work with the teachers at the ECSs from this learning perspective. I approached my interactions with teachers as learning opportunities for both of us; I planned next steps with their perspectives in mind; I assessed our progress in light of their participation and thinking about our work. By facilitating their learning, I was aiming to

build their capacity to facilitate their students' learning. At the same time, I was building their capacity to sustain their own learning—which to me is the ultimate goal of reform.

Unfortunately, I did not experience the same learning perspective from the reform agency staff with whom I was equally involved. The way in which the agency structured change for the schools suggested that they took a more implementation perspective toward reform. They set out tasks and procedures for the schools rather than stating goals and offering guidelines for achieving those goals. They emphasized the need for all schools to have certain structures in place—a leadership team, a resource allocation plan, a literacy block in the schedule, and others—regardless of how useful they were in light of current structures or how well received they were by individuals in the schools. Particularly during the first year, they treated coaches in much the same way they treated schools, asking us to complete the same tasks, convey the same messages, agree to the same conditions. When we tried to resolve our differences at meetings, we were in fact debating the merits of a learning v. implementation perspective, but did not realize it.

In the second year, because of the evaluators' report and subsequent discussions, our different perspectives became better (though not fully) aligned, with coaches helping to map out the stages of reform a school might experience and the reformers accepting various forms of evidence of change. Thanks to the coaches' coach, who mediated many aspects of differences behind the scenes, we agreed to disagree; we tried to learn from each other; we put our multiple perspectives to use in collaborative endeavors. But the need for schools to show more progress in meeting the reform agenda made it feel like implementation was more important than learning. The real issue of whether a learning or an implementation perspective better served the goals of the project, the schools involved or the coaches charged with facilitating change was never discussed nor was the possibility that it took some of both perspectives to make reform happen. In part, this stemmed from our earlier history. More importantly, I do not think we were fully able to comprehend our differences while steeped in them.

At this point, it is my contention that being cast in the middle of reform complicated the role of coaching for me not just because I became caught between the demands of the reformers and the needs of the teachers, or between the directives of the agency and the agenda of the schools. It was further confounded by my natural inclination toward the learning perspective of change and my perception of the agency's inclination toward an implementation orientation. The discrepancy in our views about reform was exacerbated by the way in which I was treating teachers as learners while the agency treated me as one of its implementers. It became disconcerting to be a coach whose beliefs and practices were learning oriented in the context of a reform project that was more implementation oriented. While improvements in professional development lessened my frustrations in the second year, it took this self-study for me to realize that the realities of reform are best framed not as a dichotomy between a learning or implementation perspective. Rather, they can be better understood as a blend of the two, a nesting of implementation within a context of learning, a recognition of the power of both.

Implications for reform

This self study of my experience as a coach for two early childhood schools has enabled me to uncover what I knew only tacitly at the time about the role of a professional developer/change agent cast in the middle of a reform effort. The interrogation of data collected over two years has led me to a deeper understanding of the change process and the significance of professional development for everyone engaged in that process. I believe the lessons I learned hold implications for other reformers and raises questions for further consideration.

First, regarding the nature of change, this case was another reminder about the complexity of change and the importance of attention to its process. Like others before me, I found that I was changed as I tried to facilitate the change of teachers and that the process was less likely to be immediate and wholesale and more likely to involve nuances, subtleties and slight revisions to earlier ways of thinking and doing. Whether we are teachers or professional developers, the targets or facilitators of change, we need to remember that process is as important and as necessary as content and "how they are interwoven in any given reform effort is hard to predict and difficult to describe." (Lieberman & Miller, 1999, p. 11) This is a challenge we should embrace rather than try to rectify. At the same time, it raises questions that beg consideration. How is the reformers' view of change reflected in the design of the reform project? How does the professional developer/change agent's understanding of the change process further or complicate the reform agenda? How do differences in perspective alter the course of reform?

Second, sensitivity to the change process also means interrogating our own and others' assumptions about how learning happens in people and organizations. Because our beliefs about learning are fundamental to our practices on change, we need to negotiate our differences or they will interfere with our work in obvious or not-so-obvious ways as happened to me. Tony Wagner (1998) suggests that it is time to structure change in ways that are consistent with our understanding of how learning takes place and how organizations change. He proposes a constructivist approach to schools in sharp contrast to the conventional practices I encountered. His ideas are appealing but also raise questions. Has a constructivist approach produced more change in schools? Is it more effective with some schools than others and to which schools is it a better match? How could the tenets of a constructivist approach be incorporated into current reform plans?

Third, this case also serves well as a reminder about the need for the professional development of professional developers. My experience as a professional developer/change agent resonates with those whose stories have been told elsewhere. Our collective experiences point to the challenges intrinsic to the work of facilitating teacher change, work that is embedded in the contexts of schools and intricacies of teacher beliefs. Our stories also reveal how who we are as professional developers or teacher educators impacts on the way in which we structure change experiences for teachers and how vulnerable we become when our personal histories are neglected. Each of us has learned first hand that our own professional development is key to our success as professional developers. But how does our own professional development enable the professional development of teachers and the transformation of their schools? What configuration of factors contributes to our success or demise as change agents? How can reform serve as professional development for all parties involved in improving schools?

Some of us who are coaches may continue to voice our own perspectives on these and related issues, while others may choose to participate in studies led by other researchers. Whatever the case, our role as participants in change needs to be reflected in the research on reform. Our questions about and interpretations of our experiences are a rich resource for future reform efforts.

In sum, this paper was written to call attention to those of us caught in the middle of reform and provoke discussion and study of reform from our perspective. It raised questions for all of us about the meaning of change and the role of professional development in that process. It was meant further to push all of us to think deeper about what is happening in our schools and why.

References

Barth, R. (1990). Improving schools from within. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Clandinin, D. & Connelly, F. (1996). Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes: Teacher stories—stories of teachers—school stories—stories of schools. Educational Researcher, 25(3), 25-30.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S.L. (1993). Inside/outside: Teacher research and teacher knowledge. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cohen, D.K. & Ball, D.L. (1990). Policy and practice: An overview. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 12, 347-353.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Policy and change: Getting beyond bureaucracy. In Hargreaves, A., Lieberman, A., Fullan, M. & Hopkins, D. (Eds.).International Handbook of Educational Change. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Darling-Hammond, L. & McLaughlin, M. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 76(8), 597-604.

Freidus, H. (1996). The co-construction of professional knowledge. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Freidus, H. & Grose, C. (1998). Implementing curriculum change: Lessons from the field. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Freidus, H., McNamara, M., & Grose, C. (1997). Something old, something new: Issues arising from the implementation of a holistic literacy program within an urban school system. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference, Scottsdale.

Fullan, M. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. NY: Teachers College Press.

Guskey, T. (1995). Professional development in education: In search of the optimal mix. In Guskey, T. & Huberman, M. (Eds.). Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hamilton, M.L., & Richardson, V. (1995). Effects of the culture in two schools on the process and outcomes of staff development. Elementary School Journal, 94(4), 367-385.

Hoffman, J. & Pearson, P.D. (2000). Reading teacher education in the next millennium: What your grandmother's teacher didn't know that your granddaughter's teacher should. Reading Research Quarterly, 35(1), 28-44.

Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (1995). Student achievement through staff development. (2nd Ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Lampert, M. (2000). Knowing teaching: The intersection of research on teaching and qualitative research. Harvard Educational Review, 70(1), 86-99.

Lieberman, A. (1995). Practices that support teacher development. Phi Delta Kappan, 76(8), 591-6.

Lieberman, A. & Miller, L. (1991). Staff development for education in the 90's: New demands, new realities. NY: Teachers College Press.

Lieberman, A. & Miller, L. (1999). Teachers—Transforming their world and their work. New York: Teachers College Press.

Little, J. W. (1993). Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15, 129-151.

Little, J. W. (1999). Teachers' professional development in the context of high school reform: Findings from a three-year study of restructuring schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic Inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Loucks-Horsley, S. & Steigelbauer, S. (1991). Using knowledge of change to guide staff development. In A. Lieberman & L. Miller (Eds.). Staff development for education in the 90's: New demands, new realities, new perspectives. NY: Teachers College Press.

McLaughlin, M. (1998). Listening and learning from the field: Tales of policy implementations and situated practice. . In Hargreaves, A., Lieberman, A., Fullan, M. & Hopkins, D. (Eds.).International handbook of educational change. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Neufeld, B. & Woodworth, K. (1997). Focus on coaches: A memo from Education Matters, Inc. Cambridge, MA.

Richardson, V. (1990). Significant and worthwhile change in teaching practice. Educational Researcher, 19(7), 10-18.

Rust, F. O.C. (1989). How supervisors think about teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 39(2), 56-64.

Rust, F. O'C. , Ely, M., Krasnow, M. & Miller, L. (1998). Professional development of change agents: Swimming with and against the currents. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Sebring, P. B. & Bryk, A. (2000). School leadership and the bottom line in Chicago. Phi Delta Kappan, 81(6), 440-443.

Showers, B., Joyce, B. & Bennett, B. (1987). Synthesis of research on staff development: A framework for future study and a state-of-the-art analysis. Educational Leadership, 45(3), 77-87.

Sparks, D. & Hirsh, S. (1997). A New Vision for Staff Development. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Sykes, G. & Darling-Hammond, L. (Eds.). (1999). Teaching as the learning professiona: Handbook of policy and practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stein, M.K., Smith, M. S., & Silver, E.A. (1999). Harvard Educational Review, 69(3), 237-269.

Ullman, J. (1999). Voices from the middle: A view of whole school reform through the eyes of professional developers who serve as change agents. Proposal to 2000 AERA Annual Meeting.

Wagner, T. (1998). Change as collaborative inquiry. Phi Delta Kappan, 79(7), 512-517.

Wilson, S.M. & Ball, D.L. (1996). Helping teachers meet the standards: New challenges for teacher educators. Elementary School Journal, 97, 121-138.

Zeitlin, A.G., MacLeod, E., & Michener, D. (1998). Professional development of teachers of language minority student through university-school partnership. Teacher Education and Special Education, 21(2), 109-120.